	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/561,220	RONEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CATHY K. WORLEY	1638
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>CATHY K. WORLEY</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Martin Moynihan</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 August 2008	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: ☐ No		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate n directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate n did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/561,220

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to inform the Applicant that the amended product claims were in condition for allowance, and therefore, the Examiner would rejoin the process claims, however, the only process claims were in the same scope as the allowable product claims were claims 14 and 24. The Applicant and the Examiner discussed Examiner's amendments to the broader process claims, especially claims 12 and 21; and they came to agreement on the Examiner's amendments to bring the application to condition for allowance.